



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1440  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/976,301	10/11/2001	Steve Grove	2043.53US1	1851

21186 7590 12/16/2005

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH  
1600 TCF TOWER  
121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2143

DATE MAILED: 12/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/976,301

Applicant(s)

GROVE, STEVE

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 08 April 2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/17/2005 *DE*
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 48 are presented for examination.

#### *Drawings*

2. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “*question*” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
3. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “*wherein said selected language construct is predetermined question that is asked by said first entity and translated responsive to said selection by said first entity*” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
4. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “*said predetermined question is asked by said first entity in an electronic commerce transaction over said network*” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.
5. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “*said predetermined question is*

Art Unit: 2143

*translated responsive to said selection of said first entity by retrieving said translated language construct from a table that includes a plurality translated language constructs of said predetermined question that are respectively translated into different languages” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.*

6. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “second transmission includes a plurality of interactive fields to allow said second entity to respond to said predetermined question that is asked by said first entity” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

7. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “*said plurality of interactive fields includes a first interactive field, wherein said first interactive field includes a drop down list that contains a second plurality of predetermined language constructs that respectively translated into a second language based on a language preference of said second entity*” must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

8. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the “*receiving a reply message from said second entity that includes a selection of the said second entity from said first interactive field, said selection of the second entity including a response from said second entity to said*

Art Unit: 2143

*predetermined question that is asked by said first entity*" must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 2143

10. Claims 1 – 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

11. Claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 23, 27, 34, 38 and 45 – 48 recite the use of a predetermined question. There is not disclosure of a predetermined question in the specification. Furthermore, the limitations of newly added claims are not found in the specification. Applicant is asked to specifically point to the specification and drawing to support their newly added and amended claims.

12. Claims that are dependent on claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 23, 27, 34, 38 and 45 – 48 are rejected for their dependency on claims 1, 5, 12, 16, 23, 27, 34, 38 and 45 – 48.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2143

14. Claims 1, 3 – 5, 9 – 12, 14 – 16, 20 – 23, 25 – 27, 31 – 34, 36 – 38 and 42 – 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flanagan et al. (5966685) (hereinafter Flanagan).

15. Referencing claim 1, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches a method to facilitate translation of communications between entities over a network, said method comprising:

16. communicating a plurality of predetermined language constructs to a first entity as a first transmission over said network, (e.g., col. 4, lines 21 – 37);

17. responsive to selection by said first entity of a language construct of said plurality of predetermined language constructs, identifying a translated language construct corresponding to said selected language construct, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36); and

18. communicating said translated language construct to a second entity as a second transmission over said network, wherein said selected language construct is predetermined setup that is requested by said first entity and translated responsive to said selection by said first entity, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36). Although Flanagan does not explicitly teach the use of a question, it is well known in the art and would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that if a user is entering a chat and is required to enter information about what language the user would like information to be presented to them, it would be implied that the system is “asking a question” even though it is not stated in a propositional phrase. Furthermore, both outcomes are the same, the system has information on what language to translate to and/or from.

Art Unit: 2143

19. Referencing claim 3, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches retrieving entity information relating to said second entity based on an identifier of said second entity selected by said first entity, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36); and

20. retrieving said translated language construct from a table based on said entity information and said selected language construct, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36).

21. As to claim 4, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches said entity information further comprises a language preference of said second entity, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36).

22. Referencing claim 5, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches said predetermined setup is requested by said first entity in an electronic commerce transaction over said network, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36). Although Flanagan does not explicitly teach the use of a question, it is well known in the art and would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that if a user is entering a chat and is required to enter information about what language the user would like information to be presented to them, it would be implied that the system is “asking a question” even though it is not stated in a propositional phrase. Furthermore, both outcomes are the same, the system has information on what language to translate to and/or from.

23. Referencing claim 9, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches said translated language construct is generated and stored, and said correspondence to said selected



Art Unit: 2143

language construct is defined, prior to communication of said plurality of language constructs to said first entity as said first transmission, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36).

24. Referencing claim 10, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches at a network-based transaction facility, storing said plurality of predetermined language constructs and an associated plurality of translated language constructs so as to define a correspondence between each language construct of said plurality of predetermined language constructs and at least one associated translated language construct of said plurality of translated language constructs , (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36).

25. Referencing claim 11, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches said storing is so as to define a correspondence between a set of said plurality of translated language constructs, each translated language construct of said set comprising a predetermined translation of a common underlying language construct , (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36).

26. As per claim 45, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches said predetermined question is translated responsive to said selection of said first entity by retrieving said translated language construct from a table that includes a plurality translated language constructs of said predetermined question that are respectively translated into different languages, (e.g. col. 4, lines 21 – 37 & col. 5, line 45 – 36).

Art Unit: 2143

27. Claims 12, 14 – 16, 20 – 23, 25 – 27, 31 – 34, 36 – 38 and 42 – 44 are rejected for similar reasons stated above.

28. Claims 2, 6, 7, 13, 17, 18, 24, 28, 29, 35, 39, 40 and 46 – 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flanagan in further view of Scanlan (6857022).

29. Referencing claim 2, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan does not specifically teach communicating a plurality of interactive fields to said second entity in said second transmission to allow said second entity to interact with at least one interactive field of said plurality of interactive fields in response to said translated language construct. Scanlan teaches communicating a plurality of interactive fields to said second entity in said second transmission to allow said second entity to interact with at least one interactive field of said plurality of interactive fields in response to said translated language construct, (e.g. col. 3, line 63 – col. 4, line 13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Flanagan with Scanlan because utilizing a drop down menu allows the user to not type information into the system and possibly mistyping information, causing errors in the system.

30. Referencing claim 6, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan does not specifically teach said first transmission is a Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML) message. Scanlan teaches said first transmission is a Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML) message, (e.g., col. 1, lines 17 – 38). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2143

time the invention was made to combine Scanlan with Flanagan because it would be obvious that in a communication with a web server that the first communication would be a type of HTTP message.

31. As to claim 7, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan does not specifically teach said second transmission is an electronic mail message. Scanlan teaches said second transmission is an electronic mail message, (e.g. col. 6, lines 31 – 65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Scanlan with Flanagan because of similar reasons stated above, also utilizing email gives users the ability to communicate with other users across a network.

32. As per claim 46, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan teaches all that is similar to claim 46 as taught in claims 1 and 45 above. Furthermore, Scanlan teaches interactive fields as taught above. Similarly reasons for combining are also found above.

33. As per claim 47, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan does not specifically teach said plurality of interactive fields includes a first interactive field, wherein said first interactive field includes a drop down list that contains a second plurality of predetermined language constructs that respectively translated into a second language based on a language preference of said second entity. Scanlan teaches said plurality of interactive fields includes a first interactive field, wherein said first interactive field includes a drop down list that contains a second plurality of predetermined language constructs that respectively translated into a second

Art Unit: 2143

language based on a language preference of said second entity, (e.g. col. 6, lines 31 – 65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Scanlan with Flanagan because of similar reasons stated above.

34. As per claim 48, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan does not specifically teach receiving a reply message from said second entity that includes a selection of the said second entity from said first interactive field, said selection of the second entity including a response from said second entity to said predetermined question that is asked by said first entity. Scanlan teaches receiving a reply message from said second entity that includes a selection of the said second entity from said first interactive field, said selection of the second entity including a response from said second entity to said predetermined question that is asked by said first entity, (e.g. col. 6, lines 31 – 65). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Scanlan with Flanagan because of similar reasons stated above.

35. Claims 13, 17, 18, 24, 28, 29, 35, 39 and 40 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

36. Claims 8, 19, 30 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Flanagan in view of Christy (6301554).

Art Unit: 2143

37. As to claim 8, as closely interpreted by the Examiner, Flanagan does not specifically teach said identifier of said second entity is an electronic mail address of said second entity. Christy teaches said identifier of said second entity is an electronic mail address of said second entity, (e.g. col. 2, line 47 – col. 3, line 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Christy with Flanagan because of similar reasons stated above. Furthermore, in an email system, in order to send a message, one must have a type of identifier, “an address”, or the email cannot be sent.

38. Claims 19, 30 and 41 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

### *Response to Arguments*

39. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

40.

41.

### *Conclusion*

42. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- 43. a. Appleby U.S. Patent No. 6463404 discloses Translation.
- 44. b. Shakib et al. U.S. Patent No. 5778213 discloses Multilingual storage and retrieval.
- 45. c. Chong et al. U.S. Patent No. 5497319 discloses Machine translation and telecommunications system.
- 46. d. Christy U.S. Patent No. 5884247 discloses Method and apparatus for automated language translation.
- 47. e. Flanagan et al. U.S. Patent No. 6292769 discloses System for automated translation of speech.
- 48. f. Horiguchi et al. U.S. Patent No. 6282507 discloses Method and apparatus for interactive source language expression recognition and alternative hypothesis presentation and selection.
- 49. g. Yamauchi et al. U.S. Patent No. 5652896 discloses Language conversion system and text creating system using such.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 571-272-3912. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 571-272-3923. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2143

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David E. England  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

De



JEFFREY P. WILLIAMS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER